

REMARKS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided generally to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the claimed subject matter, rather than to avoid prior art.

Claims 1-3 have been rejected. Claims 1-3 are cancelled. Claims 4-24 have been newly added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated August 7, 2007 are respectfully requested. Support for the added claims is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. §101 Rejections**Claims 1-3**

The Examiner has rejected claim 1-3, under 35 U.S.C. §101 because they are directed towards non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Without admitting to the propriety of the Examiner's rejections, applicant has cancelled claims 1-3. Applicant further submits that the current pending claimed subject matter in claims 4-24 disclose one or more practical applications for the invention and are directed towards statutory subject matter. Thus, applicant submits that the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner further asserts that "the invention is merely the manipulation of abstract ideas and that the data referred to by Applicant's idea of 'semantic objects' is simply an abstract construct that provides limitations in the claims to the transformation of real world data by some disclosed process" (Page 7 of Office action mailed August 7th, 2007). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The claimed subject matter of pending claims 4-24 provide substantive demonstration of the context, substance, and/or practical applications of "semantic objects". Applicant therefore asserts that concrete ideas regarding "semantic objects" are disclosed with reference to claimed

subject matter in claims 4-24 and with further reference to the extensive specification of this application describing several practical applications. Thus, applicant submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101 are not applicable to claims 4-24.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 1-3

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, under 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph because current case law (and accordingly, the MPEP) require such rejection if a §101 rejection is given. The Examiner has provided a §101 utility rejection of the claims because they purportedly fail to indicate a specific practical utility for the claimed subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Without admitting to the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, applicant has cancelled claims 1-3 and respectfully submits that the current pending claimed subject matter of claims 4-24 disclose one or more practical utility. Thus, applicant submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 are not applicable to claims 4-24. Thus, applicant submits that the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments and the preceding arguments, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance.

If the Examiner believes that a conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, he is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned counsel at (650) 838-4306 to arrange for such a conference.

No fees are believed to be due, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment in fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2207.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 6, 2007



Yenyun Fu
Registration No.: 59,141

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 22918
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 2168
Menlo Park, CA 94026-2168
(650) 838-4300